



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,351	12/05/2000	Tomohiko Teranishi	011350-265	6715

21839 7590 12/18/2006

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

BURLESON, MICHAEL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/729,351

Applicant(s)

TERANISHI ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Burleson

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 09/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant states that the reference of Salgado does not teach of a detecting unit for detecting the maximum size of document images, a selecting unit for selecting papers with a size equal to or larger than the detected maximum size and a forming unit for forming all of the multiple document images of an individual print job on the selected papers. Applicant states that Salgado discloses when the imaging system is operated in the mixed size originals mode, various image processing modes, such as auto paper selection, auto reduce/enlarge or auto center are employed (Remarks page 5). Examiner disagrees with Applicant. Salgado teaches various modes, these modes perform the functions of the present invention. In auto-fit mode, the image size of all the document images fit onto letter size paper (column 6, lines 40-51). All document images are reduced or magnified based on their size and are placed onto paper (column 6, lines 40-51). This reads on detecting unit for detecting the maximum size of document images, a selecting unit for selecting papers with a size equal to or larger than the detected maximum size and a forming unit for forming all of the multiple document images of an individual print job on the selected papers.
3. With regards to Kamijo, applicant states that the reference of Kamijo teaches that the image size after the reduction of each image data varies, since different reduction scaling factors are used for each item of image data and this teaches away from the

Art Unit: 2625

maximum size of the image data from a print job, and determines a reduction scaling factor that is based on the maximum size of the image data, as well as the size of the paper on which the images are to be printed. Examiner disagrees with Applicant.

Kamijo teaches of comparing the maximum and minimum size of data images and compresses the images using a logarithm as the coefficient if the difference is larger than the specified value and reduces the size if the difference between the maximum and minimum size images is smaller than the specified value (page 2, paragraph 0011 of translation). Kamijo also states that all images are scaled down (page 2, paragraph 0013 of translation). This reads that all images are reduced using the same reduction scaling factors.

4. Rejection of claims 6-11 is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Salgado et al. US 5946527.

3. Regarding claim 6, Salgado et al. teaches of receiving mixed size documents and detects the largest sheet and proceed to image process the documents (column

Art Unit: 2625

6, lines 17-40), which reads on an image forming apparatus, comprising; a receiving unit for receiving an individual print job comprising image data based on multiple document images of various sizes; a detecting unit for detecting a maximum size of document images; a selecting unit for selecting paper with a size equal to or larger than the detected maximum size and a forming unit for forming images based on the image data on the selected paper.

4. Claims 7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fumiaki Kamijo (hereby known as Kamijo) JP 10174052.

5. Regarding claim 7, Kamijo teaches of receiving pictures having various sizes and detecting the maximum size of the images (page 2, paragraph 009-0011), which reads on receiving unit for receiving an individual print job comprising image data based on multiple document images of various sizes and detecting unit for detecting a maximum size of the document images. Kamijo teaches of calculating a scale factor (page 2, paragraph 0011-0013 and 00221), which reads on calculating unit for calculating a scaling factor that causes the detected maximum size to match with the size of a print area. Kamijo teaches that the target images are reduced and an image is created and displayed (page 2, paragraph 0013), which reads on a processing unit for scaling up or down the sizes of the document images based on the calculated scaling factor and a forming unit for forming images based on the processed image data on the print area.

6. Regarding claim 10, the structural elements of apparatus claim 7 performs all of the steps of method claim 10. Thus, claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 7.

7. Regarding claim 11, Although Kamijo does not claim a computer readable medium; it is well known that method applications are stored on a computer readable medium. The method of claim 7 performs all of the steps of claim 11. Thus, claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fumiaki Kamijo (hereby known as Kamijo) JP 10174052 in view of Salgado et al. US 5946527.

10. Regarding claim 8, Kamijo teaches of receiving pictures having various sizes and detecting the maximum size of the images (page 2, paragraph 009-0011), which reads on receiving unit for receiving an individual print job comprising image data based on multiple document images of various sizes and detecting unit for detecting a maximum

Art Unit: 2625

size of the document images. Kamijo teaches of calculating a scale factor (page 2, paragraph 0011-0013 and 00221), which reads on calculating unit for calculating a scaling factor that causes the detected maximum size to match with the size of a print area. Kamijo teaches that the target images are reduced and an image is created and displayed (page 2, paragraph 0013), which reads on a processing unit for scaling up or down the sizes of the document images based on the calculated scaling factor and a forming unit for forming images based on the processed image data on the print area.

11. Kamijo fails to teach of the print area is the entire area of a sheet of paper.

12. Salgado et al. teaches that all document images are processed on the selected documents (column 6, lines 35-38), which reads on print area is the entire area of a sheet of paper.

13. The apparatus of Kamijo could have been modified to make the print area is the entire area of a sheet of paper of Salgado et al. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in order to process large images.

14. Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fumiaki Kamijo (hereby known as Kamijo) JP 10174052 in view of Moro US 5357348.

15. Regarding claim 9, Kamijo teaches of receiving pictures having various sizes and detecting the maximum size of the images (page 2, paragraph 009-0011), which reads on receiving unit for receiving an individual print job comprising image data based on multiple document images of various sizes and detecting unit for detecting a maximum

size of the document images. Kamijo teaches of calculating a scale factor (page 2, paragraph 0011-0013 and 00221), which reads on calculating unit for calculating a scaling factor that causes the detected maximum size to match with the size of a print area. Kamijo teaches that the target images are reduced and an image is created and displayed (page 2, paragraph 0013), which reads on a processing unit for scaling up or down the sizes of the document images based on the calculated scaling factor and a forming unit for forming images based on the processed image data on the print area.

16. Kamijo fails to teach of the print area is an area obtained by dividing the entire area of a sheet of paper into equal parts.

17. Moro teaches that the copying sheets (105-109) are divided up into equal parts (figure 13 and column 10, lines 56-67), which reads on the print area is an area obtained by dividing the entire area of a sheet of paper into equal parts.

18. The apparatus of Kamijo could have been modified to divide the print area of a sheet of paper of Salgado et al. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in order to process large images.

Conclusion

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2625

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Michael Burleson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7460 and fax number is (571) 273-7460. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. – 4:30p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached at (571) 272-7437.

Michael Burleson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2626



Mlb
December 9, 2006



DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800